DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 902 CE 034 568

AUTHOR	Holloway, Wilfred B.
TITLE	Youth Participation: A Strategy to Increase the Role of In-School Youth in Creating Job Opportunities. Occasional Paper #4.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Coll. of Human Ecology at Cornell Univ.; Youthwork, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 80
NOTE	49p.; For related documents see CE 034 567-569.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; Disadvantaged Youth; *Employment Opportunities; *Employment Programs; *Job Development; Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; *Student Participation; Youth; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*In School Youth; *Youthwork National Policy Study

ABSTRACT

Through a study, strategies were investigated to increase the role of in-school youth in creating job opportunities. Drawing upon qualitative data provided by the Youthwork National Policy Study, researchers examined four youth-operated employment projects in order to isolate those factors that either hinder or facilitate the implementation of a youth participation strategy; they subsequently made recommendations on how best to implement a strategy for youth participation. Two factors that especially seemed to inhibit youth participation were the location of the project in a traditional school setting and the failure to encourage youth to take an active role in managing the project. Included among those factors found to promote the youth participation strategy were the following: a high ratio of adults to youth, the delegation of authority for the everyday activities of the project to the youth involved in it, relatively small numbers (10 or less) of youth working together, and access within the community to persons with expertise in the area of youth enterprise. Recommendations included a call for hiring staff members partly on the basis of their commitment to the idea that youth can and should manage their own affairs. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224902

youth participation: a strategy to increase the role of in-school youth in creating job opportunities

Wilfred B. Holloway

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Rist

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OCCASIONAL PAPER #4

YOUTHWORK NATIONAL POLICY STUDY
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York
August 1980

CE 034 528

youthwork national policy study
n124 mvr hall
cornell university
ithaca new york 14853

(607)256 4431

OVERVIEW

YOUTH PARTICIPATION: A PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A STRATEGY TO INCREASE THE ROLE OF IN-SCHOOL YOUTH IN CREATING JOB OPPORTUNITIES.

Occasional Paper #4 is one in a continuing series to be prepared by the Youthwork National Policy Study on selected aspects of the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects. These projects are conducted under the auspices of Title IV, Part A of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) of 1977. The projects are a set of local programs which represent an effort by the U.S. Department of Labor to explore improved means of providing employment and training opportunities for young people, particularly those from low-income and minority families. The Exemplary-In-School Demonstration Projects are administered through Youthwork, Inc., an intermediary, non-profit corporation.

This paper examines the implementation of a youth participation strategy at four projects expected to be youth-operated. The data was gathered during the first year of operation of these projects (1978-79). On-site observers at each of the projects were in constant contact with adult staff and youth participants while providing data to the Youthwork National Policy Study. Interviews with program directors, operators, and youth have all been incorporated into this report.

Copies of this report may be obtained by writing in care of the above address.

August 1980

a collaborative project of Youthwork, Inc. and New York State College of Human Ecology, a statutory college of the state university

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank the on-site observers who have assisted the Youthwork National Policy Study with data collection at the local sites. Special mention and thanks must also be given to the project personnel (both adult and youth) who have given their time and energy for this effort. For the purpose of maintaining our promise of anonymity, the names of these persons are not included here. Those who have participated will know who they are and they have our great appreciation.

Very special thanks go to Dr. Ray C. Rist, principal investigator of the Youthwork National Policy Study, for his helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper and to Karen Adams for her work in helping to prepare the manuscript. While many others have played a role in the development of this paper, final responsibility for the contents and accuracy of this paper must remain with me.

Wilfred B. Holloway

August 1980

ACRONYMS

CETA	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act
YETP	Youth Employment and Training Program
YEDPA	Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act
YCCIP	Youth Community Conservation Improvement Programs
MIS	Management Information System

INTRODUCTION

The Youth Employment and Demonstrations Projects Act (YEDPA) became law on August 5, 1977. It amended the 1973 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) to provide the initiative for an expanded effort to address the problems of youth unemployment. YEDPA added several new programs to improve employment and training opportunities for young people in their late teens and early twenties, particularly those from low-income families. It has sought to emphasize more experimentation and innovation on the part of the CETA local government sponsor system than has been the case with programs developed for unemployed adults.

The Act is particularly concerned with overcoming the barriers between school and work by more closely linking education, employment, and training institutions. It seeks to encourage new relationships. One of the four programs authorized by YEDPA was the Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP). This program was designed to provide a

full range of work experiences and skills necessary for future employment, especially for those low-income youth, 16 to 21 years of age, who are in school or out of school.

What provides a sense of urgency to this effort is that there is a desperate need to improve the education of low-income minority youth and to find the means to create more employment for them. The evidence on this point is both conclusive and sobering: the situation for poor minority youth, as compared with white middle class youth, has steadily deteriorated over the past fifteen years. Whether one measures employment rates or labor force participation rates, the disparities have grown and continue to do so, in spite of all the education, employment, and training programs initiated since the mid-1960s (Adams and Mangum, 1978:19-34).

The spending level for YEDPA for fiscal year 1980 has been approximately $1.2 billion. The first priority for these funds has been to generate employment opportunities for youth. They have become an integral component of efforts by the administration to reduce the present levels of unemployment. Nevertheless, and in recognition that present approaches to reducing youth unemployment are imperfect, both in design and implementation, the Act has authorized the Secretary of Labor to allocate up to one-fifth of YEDPA funds on demonstration projects to support knowledge development. The mandate from the Congress was clear:

> Sec. 321. It is the purpose of this part to establish a variety of employment, training, and demonstration programs to explore methods of dealing with the structural unemployment problems of the nation's youth. The basic purpose of the demonstration programs shall be to test the relative efficacy of the different ways of dealing with these problems in different local contexts.

> Sec. 348. ...to carry out innovative and experimental programs, to test new approaches for dealing with the unemployment problems of youth, and to enable eligible participants to prepare for, enhance their prospects for, or secure employment in occupations through which they may reasonably be expected to advance to productive working lives. Such programs shall include, where appropriate, cooperative arrangements with educational agencies to provide special programs and services...

The monies that were to be distributed according to formula among the local sponsors of programs for youth would alleviate some unemployment and "buy time". New ideas, new approaches, and new actors would have to be on the scene if innovative and path-breaking approaches were to be found. And while it was not explicit in the legislation, it can be surmised that it was the hope of the authors that if successful projects could be located where jobs were created and the youth were prepared to assume them, then perhaps cities and states would be encouraged to redirect portions of their own funds towards projects of this kind. Thus, the discretionary funds could achieve a ripple effect throughout the entire structure of youth employment and training programs.

To learn more about one aspect of the complex set of relations between education and present/future employment opportunities, the Department of Labor set aside from the discretionary funds approximately $15 million for "Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects". These grants were to explore the dynamics of in-school projects and their effectiveness. They also would be awarded to promote cooperation between the education and employment and training systems.

To assist the Department of Labor and its regional offices in undertaking this effort, Youthwork, Inc., an intermediary non-profit corporation, was established in January 1978. It was created with

financial and administrative support from the Field Foundation, the Public Welfare Foundation, the Southern Education Foundation, the Taconic Foundation, and the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute. Youthwork's responsibilities were to include: developing guidelines for the competition to select the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects, reviewing submitted proposals, making recommendations for funding, providing guidance and technical assistance for those projects selected in the competition, developing and implementing a knowledge development plan so as to increase understanding of different approaches and their effectiveness, and forwarding research reports and policy recommendations to the Department of Labor.

As a result of a five-tier evaluation process designed to select from among the more than 520 submitted proposals, Youthwork made its recommendations to the Department of Labor. Forty-eight projects were chosen in each of four focal areas: academic credit, career awareness, private sector, and youth-operated. The first contracts were signed and projects began operation in September 1978. Forty-seven of the original 48 projects have been or are now operational.

To assess these projects and their efficacy in achieving the twin goals of program effectiveness and inter-institutional collaboration, Youthwork undertook a number of knowledge development efforts. These were to include the use of analytic ethnographic material collected by a trained observer placed at each project, third-party evaluators, MIS systems, and self-study reports from the individual projects.

For the first of these efforts, that of developing a cross-site comparative framework employing qualitative data collection strategies,

Youthwork, Inc., selected in September 1978 a group of researchers at the College of Human Ecology, Cornell University. The Cornell project, entitled "Youthwork National Policy Study", has undertaken a longitudinal case study research program. Trained observers at each of the project sites have been gathering data on key national policy issues. These data are, in turn, used by the Cornell staff as the bases for reports. These data have been used to construct this examination of youth participation at four youth-operated projects.

RATIONALE FOR YOUTH PARTICIPATION PROGRAMS

Konopka (1973) suggested eight conditions for the healthy development of adolescents. These conditions, according to Konopka, should provide young people with opportunities to (p. 25):

1. Participate as citizens, as members of households, as workers, as responsible members of society.
2. Gain experience in decision making.
3. Interact with peers and acquire a sense of belonging.
4. Reflect on self in relation to others and to discover self by looking outward as well as inward.
5. Discuss conflicting values and formulate their own value system.
6. Experiment with their own identity, with relationships to other people, with ideas; to try out various roles without having to commit themselves irrevocably.
7. Develop a feeling of accountability in the context of a relationship among equals.
8. Cultivate a capacity to enjoy lif

Konopka goes on to state:

> Given these conditions, adolescents will be enabled to gain experience in forming relationships and making meaningful commitments. They are not expected by the adult world to make final lifelong commitments; the expectation is related to their own need for interdependence and humanity's need for their commitment to others without losing themselves. (p. 25)

Adolescent development in this culture is stunted by several processes that inhibit youth participation. These issues have been raised by several writers including Coleman, 1974; Hamilton and Crouter, 1980: National Commission on Resources for Youth, 1974, 1975; Conrad, 1977; Greer, 1977; and Dowell, 1977. Some of these processes are briefly described below.

Prolonged economic dependence of youth and the concurrent increase in the length of time spent in schools unnecessarily prevent youth from taking a productive role in society. The tremendous energy of youth and the yearning to feel needed make it difficult for youth to accept their current status. As Konopka (1973:27) suggests

> While technology has increased the need for more extensive knowledge and training that long schooling makes possible, educational requirements for many jobs are "standard" rather than job-related. They should be less rigid (to allow youth without these credentials to hold jobs of this nature).

In this society, there is a limited number of outlets for experimentation by youth in various adult roles. Chances for part-time work experience are "limited by the inability or unwillingness of business and industry to accept large numbers of young people into their operations and by the desire of labor organizations to lock up jobs and entrance to jobs" (Konopka, 1973:28).

Youth are denied the opportunity to participate in almost every aspect of society, e.g., schools, family, and religious groups. The legal system sets up several barriers such as age restrictions and occupational restrictions which make it difficult for youth to participate in responsible roles in society. Many of these restrictions have served noble purposes such as protecting youth from unhealthy working conditions, but many others have outlived their usefulness and now only hamper the healthy development of adolescents.

To combat the problem of the continuing isolation of youth from participation in adult roles, many scholars have suggested that youth be given more responsibility to manage their own affairs at earlier and earlier ages. Some have suggested changes in laws to permit youth to move more freely into the already established labor market. Others have proposed that various programs be established to help youth experience responsible roles without having to suffer the full consequences of their decisions or having to make lifetime commitments. These programs have generally taken the form of youth participation programs where youth are allowed to make meaningful contributions to their communities and to other human beings.

What is a youth participation program?

The National Commission on Resources for Youth (1975:25) has developed a definition that captures elements of the better youth participation programs. This definition states:

> Youth participation is involving the youth in responsible challenging action that meets not only their need to see themselves as valuable and competent but also meets a genuine need in the community. It provides them with opportunities for planning and/or decision making affecting

> others in an activity whose impact or consequence is extended to others--i.e., outside or beyond the youth participants themselves. Other desirable features of Youth Participation are provisions for critical reflection on the participatory activity and the opportunities for group effort toward a common goal.

This definition can be broken down further into component parts which can be more fully explained. Responsible, challenging action is defined as meaningful, valued activity that requires reaching beyond the previous range of one's knowledge or performance and has identifiable consequences for others. Examples of this concept include such things as programs enabling young people to provide one-to-one counseling and other learning activities for younger children who are in trouble with the police or in school. The youth receive training or support from adult staff, but the responsibility for establishing relationships with the children and developing programs rests with the youth themselves (Greer, 1977).

Several examples are provided by Greer (1977:4) to demonstrate this principle. For example:

> Each summer for several years, over a hundred inner-city teenagers, some paid by the Neighborhood Youth Corps, helped doctors test more than three thousand children for lead poisoning. They mapped out a target neighborhood and determined which apartments had children living in them. They approached the children's parents to educate them on the dangers, causes and symptoms of lead poisoning. They recorded thorough medical histories of the children and helped medical interns establish testing centers in apartments. They helped with follow-up if tests indicated the necessity.
>
> Also, in a New York City low-income area populated by people from Puerto Rico and Cuba, young people formed teams of bilingual teenagers who instructed tenants as to their legal rights, which resulted in landlords renovating the apartments. The work was difficult, often frustrating but rewarding. Some of the youngsters reported, "The people know and trust us."

To meet genuine needs requires that the youth participants become involved in tasks that both they and their community value. One example of such a program is Foxfire, a magazine that documents the folk wisdom of the old mountain people in their area and perhaps rescues a priceless cultural heritage of crafts, folkways, and memories.

Opportunities for planning and decision making involve the young people in planning the goals and the activities of the program. In each youth participation project, youth, without adults telling them, decide what the next course of action should be for their project.

Greer (1977:6) describes what is often cited as an important experience generally not available to youth. Greer suggests:

> Group effort towards a common goal has proven to be a highly motivating feature of youth and a critical factor in the success of Youth Participation projects. Young people involved in a peer counseling program can, as a group, reflect on their role in helping others, analyze their motivation and reactions and practice advanced counseling techniques. A sense of community develops as they share common problems and feelings.

These concepts define a good youth participation program. Programs should be an effort to meet the eight conditions for healthy development of adolescents as outlined by Konopka.

OBJECTIVES OF THIS STUDY

There are three objectives of this paper. They are:

(1) To explore what hinders the implementation of a youth participation strategy.

(2) To explore what facilitates the implementation of a youth participation strategy.

(3) To make recommendations on how best to implement a strategy of youth participation.

Criteria for determining successful or unsuccessful implementation of the youth participation strategy are as follows (National Commission on Resources for Youth, 1975:26-28):

*Does the project involve the youth in responsible challenging action? This means having others dependent on one's actions and the opportunity to experience the consequences of one's actions, including failure.

*Does the project meet genuine needs? The participatory action should fulfill needs for both the youth and society and involve participants in tasks that both young people and some elements of society recognize as important.

*Are youth involved in planning or decision-making which affects others? This refers to the goals and activities of the program itself. Youth should participate in both individual and group decisions in a context of problem solving, and in decisions related to their work affecting themselves and affecting others.

*Is there a chance for critical reflection about the experience? There is a need to link practice and theory. Provision for critical reflection is intended to emphasize the function of youth participation with regard to deliberate learning--the need to reflect upon and examine one's experience in order for it to take. Components of such a provision include orientation and in-service training for the program activity, a seminar in which participants discuss their experiences, and group self-evaluation.

These four points represent the criteria against which the four programs will be evaluated. The criteria are relevant because they reflect the mandate given to program operators. That mandate was spelled out in the application guidelines provided by the Department of Labor.

> ...Job creation through youth-operated projects was selected as a primary focus for Youthwork, Inc., because it raises crucial issues in national policy toward youth. Usually, young people are the objects of programs serving principally as spectators and consumers of goods and services. This passive role excludes young people from important experiences and skills. To be competent is to be the subject of an activity not the object. The measure of competence is what

> a person can do. Youth-operated projects are a way to experiment with approaches that develop competence by actively involving the enrollee in the task of creating socially meaningful and economically gainful employment (Department of Labor Application Guidelines--Exemplary Programs, 1978).

Youth are normally the consumers of programs and are not involved in the decision-making areas. As consumers only, youth have been denied important experiences and skills which would be gained from being actively involved from the planning stage through the creation, implementation, and completion of the project. Providing a place for the responsible exercise of youths' talents and abilities was the goal of youth-operated projects.

METHODOLOGY

This paper will draw upon qualitative data provided by the Youthwork National Policy Study conducted at Cornell University. This will be a secondary analysis of data collected at four projects by trained participant observers.

The data. Each of the projects participating in this study have assigned to it an on-site observer who provides data to the Youthwork National Policy Study at Cornell University. The field researchers have been trained in the application of the traditional emic approach to field work. This approach dictates that the observer should ascertain the criteria that informants use to interpret and describe their own experiences. This method has been described by other researchers as "folk system analysis" or studies of the "social construction of reality".

A significant departure from traditional ethnographic research has taken place in this study. Rather than send observers into the field and wait for the emergent issues to become apparent, time constraints as well as specific policy questions of concern to the Congress, the Department of Labor, and to Youthwork, Inc., necessitated the predefinition of the areas of investigation. This was done through the creation of analysis packets which focused on a particular area of study. The analysis packets did not specify how the data relevant to the various policy issues were to be collected, only what the areas of concern were.

Field researchers have used multiple data sources for their description and analysis of the projects. The basic strategy of data collection was that of a triangulation of data sources. The research activities of on-site observers simultaneously combined document analysis respondent and informant interviewing, direct participation, and extensive observation of the various facets of the local program.

Procedures. Four case studies will be written addressing the following questions:

(1) To what extent does each project:

   a. involve youth in responsible challenging action;

   b. meet genuine needs for both youth and the society;

   c. involve youth in planning or decision making which affects others; and

   d. provide a chance for critical reflection about the experience?

(2) What social and structural problems have inhibited/facilitated the implementation of the youth participation strategy?

Determining the effectiveness of the implementation of the youth participation strategy will be based on the four criteria described

earlier. To be designated as a successful implementation effort, a program must exhibit clear evidence on at least three of the four criteria. The following are projects in which youth participation programs.[1]

1. Helping Service to Others. These are projects in which youth participants meet regularly and face to face with other people in a helping relationship. The others may be infants and pre-school children, elementary school children, retarded or handicapped children or adults, age peers, hospital patients, or old people. In programs of this type, students typically travel several times a week to the institution (day care center, elementary school, hospital, nursing home, etc.) serving the people to be helped. The activity lends itself to the concurrent experience-based study of the related occupational fields--early childhood, child development, health services, the aged in society, etc. These programs are noteworthy for their benefits to the youth themselves, who often gain dramatically in self-esteem, responsibility, and other dimensions.

2. Community Service. These are projects that involve a group of young people in an ongoing activity that has some benefit for the community. In contrast to the helping service-type program, in which the program activity consists of direct contact between youth and the individuals being immediately served, a community service-type program involves youth in a group project activity whose impact extends to the

---

[1]The examples are taken from "Youth Participation". A report prepared for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Human Development--Office of Youth Development. A more detailed discussion is available in this paper.

community at large. Some examples are a consumer information and investigation service run by youth in San Diego and such groups as Public Service Video (at St. Paul's New City School).

3. Social Action. Social action projects are defined as those in which the energies of the group are directed toward the achievement of some specific development or change in the community--some observable tangible result. Some examples are: to end the pollution of a local river; the restoration of a historic cemetery; the passage of an ordinance protecting consumers; or the establishment of a run-away or drug rehabilitation center.

4. Community Internships. In models of this type program, participants are placed individually with adults at their work place in the community. The interns are each given their own responsibilities while they also learn about the work of the sponsor or "community teacher". The interns may meet in a seminar to discuss what they are learning or they may develop individual learning contracts or do their own community projects in conjunction with their placement. Models can range from apprenticeship programs for 9 to 15 year olds (Evergreen, Colorado) to the Executive Internship Program in which students in New York City were placed with high-ranking policy makers and officials in both public and private organizations.

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY OF IMPLEMENTATION

Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) have defined implementation as "those actions by public and private individuals (or groups) that are directed at the achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decisions".

They suggest that the study of implementation examines those factors that contribute to the realization or non-realization of policy objectives.

The objectives of any policy decision tend to be diffuse and implicit. The researcher may have to infer the objectives from a variety of documents or interviews containing statements of policy makers. The researcher must make explicit the objectives against which implementation will ultimately be measured. "Evidence, logic, and perhaps the researcher's own values will help in the process of converting the implicit objectives into explicit objectives" (Ripley, 1976, p.1). The process of converting to explicit (objectives) should be self-conscious and open so that others can judge the validity of the objectives that are stated.

The implementation process can be studied and assessed by social scientists. Ripley (1976) provides a suggestive, but not exhaustive, list of the kinds of issues that are of interest to social scientists (more fully developed schemes are available in Dror, 1968; and Jones, 1975). The list includes the following:

a) Patterns of influence over implementation decisions.

b) Patterns of cooperation or conflict in reaching implementation decisions.

c) Features in the process that may inhibit the delivery of desired services.

d) Patterns of change in process or institutional arrangements (Rivlin, 1974).

e) The offering of services and the utilization of the services by the clients.

f) The generation, storage, and retrievability of data that will be useful for conducting the evaluation of the societal impact of the program in question.

This paper focuses on those aspects that have inhibited/facilitated the implementation of the youth participation strategy. Due to limitations of the data base, target population outcomes will not be examined.

THE DATA

The data will focus upon the various dimensions of youth participation as outlined by the National Commission on Resources for Youth. The paper examines the early (first few months) implementation of the demonstration grant at four youth-operated projects by presenting a brief description of each project's efforts to implement a youth participation strategy. First, a brief look at the proposed activities at the four sites. This information is taken from the final proposal presented by the project operator to Youthwork, Inc.

Project #1

This project would develop a job identification and placement program administered by young people for their peers. Through the creation, operation, and evaluation of a job bank and placement service, 10 young people would learn the skills and responsibilities of program administration, while 60 other young people would become experienced in a variety of career alternatives through non-profit organizations that offer employment.

Youth would be recruited for the project by school guidance counselors. Peer counselors would screen applicants and place 300 participants in jobs in the community.

Project #2

This project was sponsored by a community-based organization. It is an expansion of a previous program funded by CETA monies. The project proposed to have four full-time adult staff and forty part-time in-school youth staff. Adult staff would hire and supervise; coordinate work, school and career planning; counsel individually and schedule testing at subcontracting institution; develop and maintain the collection site and repair shop; supervise route establishment and vehicle maintenance.

Youth would begin as trainees and be promoted as appropriate. They would collect and prepare materials for marketing, operate and maintain vehicles, develop pick-up routes, repair furniture and appliances, learn manual skills, run the office, type, file, compose letters and reports, keep books and data, interview, manage, supervise, and plan the operation of the business.

Youth involvement would also include acting as a board member for the parent organization. It was expected that youth would provide the dominant leadership for the project by the end of the sixth month of operation. Weekly meetings and a peer review process were designed to insure youth participation.

Project #3

This project would provide training and employment through four small youth-operated businesses. Youth in all four businesses who reveal a need or desire for supplementary education in basic skills would receive supplemental education classes from the local high school. The businesses to be developed include child care, house repair, office skill training, and farm production.

Project #4

This project would create a central office run by secondary school students to receive real work, jobs for pay requests for in-school jobs. Five components of the program will serve participating youth. All students would plan together on the projects in the morning, with non-income eligible students returning to their home schools in the afternoon.

Each component would create jobs for participating youth. As these students become sufficiently trained to be employable, vocational counselors would find them jobs in the private sector, allowing additional students to enter the in-school job training program. Students working in the central office would, however, be more or less permanent for records, data collection, and business needs.

> ...Exemplary features would be the fact that students themselves operate the components as entrepreneurs and managers, that student leaders would be among the original group of planners, that basic skills could be taught outside the classroom as participants encounter basic skill needs in their jobs, that a work ethic of service would be instilled in action-oriented projects, and finally that the variety of components would create over 200 career skill developmental opportunities for youth.

THE FINDINGS

The next step is to review data from the youth-operated projects that illustrates either successful or unsuccessful implementation of a youth participation strategy. Evidence from sites where youth participation was achieved would be used to better understand how to

implement a youth participation strategy. Instances where participation was proposed but not achieved will be examined to understand why it failed to appear and to identify the structures that inhibited youth participation.

Project #1

This project was one which rated high on youth participation. Youth were utilized as the primary staff of the project. The effort involved counseling and job placement of community youth. The structure of the project was such that it encouraged independent action and youth participation.

Responsible Challenging Action

This project placed an emphasis on meeting the criterion of youth participation. The youth who acted as peer counselors and job developers were responsible for placing over 300 participatns into jobs with non-profit and public agencies around the area. The group had t: formulate plans and coordinatore their activities to make such an endeavor possible. Clearly, the placement of 300 CETA eligible youth in jobs was a major undertaking.

Initially, one aspect of the program in which the youth peer staff was not involved was the selection of participants for the program. Those youth who would be placed in jobs were selected through a process of school counselor referral. As the on-site observer discovered at a meeting of school and CETA officials:

> ...The participant selection process which was in progress was reviewed. It was agreed that the administration's adaptation of the counselor's referral process was discriminatory, in that ethnic segments indicated in the grant proposal were being adjusted to school populations. In other words, white disadvantaged students had no chance of being selected in predominantly black schools. Also, the youth staff and youth population in general had no (input) who or how applicants would be selected. (November 1978)

This process was subsequently modified to allow the youth staff to participate in the selection process. The observer describes the new system:

> ...The process was to be as follows: 1) development of a short questionnaire by job coach and in-school administrators, 2) make a general announcement on high school public address systems similar to the following: all students with approved CETA applications on file interested in participating in the Youth Operated Work program, please report to the counselors office by a date to be determined (December, 1978), 3) Youth staff could select likely candidates from responses to the questionnaire for interviews. (November, 1978)

The third party evaluator expressed concern over the role of the youth staff in evaluating the project. The grant for the project specifically stated that youth were to be involved in all aspects of the project. The evaluator's attitude seemed to reflect a lack of faith in the youth's ability to handle the responsibilities involved in evaluating the project. The evaluator was quoted by the observer as saying:

> ...Youth staff involvement in evaluation activities was an expressed concern of mine because of program and evaluation contamination possibilities. I suggested to the Job Coach that I continue to provide technical assistance and training as it relates to evaluation, i.e. interviewing skills, tester interpretation as a function of the staff's in-service training. I could then build in the evaluation to the counseling needs of the youth staff. (November, 1978)

Given the severe nature of the youth unemployment problem in urban areas, the task of this project, to employ 300 CETA eligible youth, was a challenging one, involving the youth staff in activities that require responsible action.

Does the Project Meet Genuine Needs?

This project focuses on providing employment for disadvantaged youth. Given its focus, it attempts to meet one of the pressing needs of the larger society. This particular project is located in an urban black environment

and serves a predominantly black population. Since unemployment rates are most severe among black youth, the goals of this project are certainly in line with the society's needs.

Individual needs of the youth should also be met by a youth participation project. In an interview with a youth staff member, the on-site observer found some interesting positive changes in the young person's perspective on life. Respondents answers are in parenthesis.

> ...Have you changed your attitude towards students as a result of this project? (I am prouder now of my work and less submissive towards teachers) And how about professionals? (Yes, I'm more their equal, I carry myself better, dress better. I have responsibilities and a title. They have to respect my position.) (December, 1978)

This same youth commented on what she felt the difference was between this project and other CETA programs. In response to the question:

> ...Do you think this program offers the same opportunities as the other CETA In-school programs? The youth staff member gave a vehement no! She declared that the youth staff was much more involved on a personal and community level.

In sum, the project seems to meet both societal and individual needs as well as being significantly different from other CETA youth programs.

Youth Involved in Planning and Decision Making

This project was high on youth involvement in planning and decision making. As was mentioned earlier, the mode of selection of participants was altered to allow youth staff to participate. Other examples of youth participation included:

*decisions on whether or not to organize a job bank

*interviewing and hiring to replace old peer staff

*involvement in Management Information System and evaluation activities.

The staff of the project included seven youth and one adult who acts as overall project supervisor. Several informational sessions were held to acquaint the youth with the paperwork requirements of their jobs. On the basis of these presentations, the youth were given the responsibility of developing the plan for having the paperwork completed on time. One such session was described by the on-site observer.

> ...Most of the presenters' comments were directed to the Youth Supervisor who would be directly responsible for the contents of the documents discussed. Comments were also made concerning the future training of the clerical person (a youth) who would be responsible for the timely and accurate processing of the materials. Filing systems options were presented including alphabetic and categorical approaches. Other issues discussed were CETA intake, employability plans, case activation, Youthwork applications, and In-school applications. (December, 1978)

The youth staff were intimately involved in the planning and decision making at this project. Youth had major responsibility for each major component of the project. The adult supervisor had overall responsibility for the project but used a decentralized scheme of management which gave major responsibilities to the youth staff. This arrangement coupled with the lack of adult presence enhanced the participation of youth in planning and decision making at the project.

Critical Reflection

Critical reflection involves a provision for orientation, in-service training for the program activity, group discussion seminars, and group self-evaluation for the participating youth. The training session described above was but one example of an opportunity for critical self-reflection by the youth.

The youth were asked by the on-site observer to evaluate their experience in the youth-operated project. One such interview conducted

during the first year is presented below. It illustrates the positive feelings the project had produced in these particular youth. The interview began as follows:

> ...How would you rate the training you have received so far on a scal- from 1-10, 1 being low, 10 being high? In general, an 8. Is the training transferable? Yes, I've learned to communicate better with people. Have you changed your attitude toward or about a) students (more sympathetic), b) teacher (N/A), and c) professionals (Yes, more responsible). Were you confident you could do this job as you left your first interview? Yes! Has that feeling of confidence changed? No. Do you think this program offers the same opportunities to youth as other CETA youth programs? The orientation is the same but our youth work longer (and have more opportunity to participate). (January 1979)

The above interview was conducted with a youth who was participating in her first CETA program.

In the first year of this project, there were several opportunities (training sessions, seminars) for critical self-reflection about the experience by the affected youth. Generally, the evaluative judgments of the youth about the project were positive, personal attitude changes being the most frequent area of change.

Project #2

In contrast to the previous project, this one represented an example where youth participation was kept to a minimum during the first year. It was apparent from the beginning who was to control this project. The following sections present examples of the barriers to youth participation by viewing the project from two sides: project staff and the youth.

Staff Perceptions

The first suggestion of the troubles that this project would experience became evident during the first few months of project operation. In November 1978, the on-site observer was brought into the middle of a meeting by a very upset project staff. The observer continues:

> ...They began to outline to me some of the problems they had encountered in the program. Two new staff had just been hired. Both of them had been introduced to the youth at a party two nights prior to this meeting. The new staff and the project coordinator told me that the youth were exhibiting such negativism and bad attitudes that it made it impossible for them to function in the program. (November, 1978)

One of the new staff, in particular, was very angry about the reception he had gotten from the youth. At his instigation, the staff created a set of by-laws:

> ...Outlining very strict guidelines for the kinds of attitudes and attendance and procedures for complaints that youth should follow as well as explicating what the repercussions were from not following the rules (as) outlined by the by-laws. (November, 1978)

It should be apparent from the above discussion that the youth had no part in either the creation or enforcement of these by-laws. Adult staff took it upon themselves to formulate the policies of the program. The goal was to firmly establish their control over the youth and the project.

Another rift, this one between the staff of the parent organization and the newly hired staff for the Youthwork project, came to symbolize the need for control by the adults over the affairs of the new project. In an interview with the new job developer, the observer reports the following comments.

> ...Then the supervisor began to talk about how the Youthwork project was having problems with the larger community based organization (of which it was a part). He stated that he felt that the project coordinator's position of authority was being undermined by staff from the parent group. Because she was a woman, she was given no authority or autonomy. He further stated and other staff agreed that parent organization staff were trying to take control of the new project. (November, 1978)

> ...The director of the parent organization was seen as siding with his staff rather than with the staff of the new project. The staff of the new project agreed upon the need to take control of the project. (November, 1978)

With these early difficulties, the emphasis of the project was shifted away from youth participation in the planning and management of a youth-operated business to a focus on adults teaching the youth "survival skills". In a comparison with an earlier project that used same model as the new project, the shift of emphasis was illustrated.

The following observation represents the views of the new staff on what the goals of the new program will be.

> ...They planned to teach the youth about how to apply for jobs, how to function in the private sector, and to give them vocational counseling on future goals for work. They stated that in the YCCIP program (another federal jobs program which had funded this project) the focus had been on establishing an on-going business. The project coordinator said that establishing the business was still important but that it would not be the primary focus of this project... Work skills such as attitudes, attendance, keeping time cards, and being responsible would be more important than the actual on-the-job training. (December, 1978)

A somewhat dramatic example of the adult staff's intent to take control was seen when the new work supervisor was asked to describe what his role would be at the project. In describing his function, he stated:

> ...(my) role will be to be on the asses of the kids. I want to establish control as their supervisor. I believe that the kids are intent on eliminating me and I am going to show them who is boss. (November, 1978)

All of the staff said that they were going to eliminate the youth manager positions. This was done, according to the staff, so that all youth would begin the new program at equal levels of responsibility and pay. Subsequent promotions were to be based on good attitudes and responsible work behavior. The elimination of these positions would seem to run counter to the project's mandate for youth participation in all aspects of project management.

Youth Perceptions

The shift of the project from a youth-operated one to an adult-run outfit was not lost on the youth. The youth were well aware of the mandate for youth participation, and the failure of the staff (adults)

to give up or share control of the project with the youth was a constant source of bad feeling throughout the first year of the project. In an interview with one of the youth, it became evident that the failure of the staff to give control of the project over to the youth was at least one of the reasons for the negative attitudes exhibited by the youth. The observer's interview began as follows:

> ...I asked her if she was upset because she had to wait for an hour. She said yes, but that she expected this kind of treatment from the project staff. I asked what she meant by that. She said that youth received no respect from staff and that they are treated like little children. The staff bossed them around and did not take their opinions and feelings into account. (November, 1978)

When asked her feelings (and the feelings of other youth) about the new project staff, the youth responded:

> ...Initially, the work supervisor position had been promised to one of the youth. A couple of youth had applied and been interviewed for that job. She felt that those youth were well qualified to act as a work site supervisor. However, an adult staff, an outsider, had been hired as the work supervisor and this made the youth very angry. She said that the youth were upset not only because the position had been promised to one of them, but also because the person who had been hired had no experience and was, therefore, not qualified to function as their supervisor. (November, 1978)

Further complicating the matter was the initial impression the new staff had made on the youth at the party a few days earlier. According to the youth:

> ...The new staff had been introduced at a party a few nights before and that the staff had made snap judgments about the youth. Staff felt that the youth were negative and exhibiting bad attitudes, but there was no basis upon which the new staff could make such judgments. She said they did not have an opportunity to get to know them and simply saw one piece of behavior under one set of circumstances and that they were making generalizations based on inadequate information about the youth. The youth were afraid to talk about their complaints because they felt they were being threatened with dismissal or probation if they did not comply with all the staff's demands. (November, 1978)

On the subject of youth participation, the youth was quite explicit about her feelings on who was running the project. I might add that her comment was not a surprising one given the earlier discussion.

> ...She said that the lines of communication between staff and youth were very unclear. The project is supposed to be youth-operated and, in fact, it is not. She said that on the one hand, youth are supposed to be staff and are supposed to take charge of the functioning of the program but that actually the adult staff are the ones who are in control and who make all of the decisions about how the program is to function. She objected to the fact that youth were not consulted, that they were lied to and that they were treated disrespectfully by the adult staff. (November, 1978)

Brief Summary

In the early stages of this project, the staff made changes in the original focus of the project which were deliberately intended to move control of the project from the youth to the adults. Through a series of moves including the creation of by-laws, the elimination of the youth manager positions, and the refusal to hire a youth as work site supervisor, the adults effectively removed youth from all managerial participation in the project.

Youth were not unaware of the changes being made. Their reaction was one of anger and frustration at the staff for not consulting them on the issues that were changed. The resultant fury between the youth and staff made for considerable delay in the evolution of the project. As one youth suggested:

> ...Over the past month while the program was going from YCCIP funding to Youthwork funding, ... most of the work had ceased. The project coordinator had been absent from the program for the entire month and was unaware of what was going on with the youth. The youth would come to work on time expecting to work but there would be no work for them to do. The youth said that then, the staff viewed this as laziness and irresponsibility on the part of the youth. In point of fact, the youth had no alternative but to hang around and talk because they were required to be there even if there was no work to perform. (November, 1978)

Youth participation was hindered by a refusal of adult staff to give up the reins of power. This reluctance on the part of the adults seems to stem from a conviction that the youth was not capable of handling the responsibility of running the project. Unfortunately, this was an assumption that was not tested because of the fears and anxieties of the adult staff. The planned shift from adult to youth management did not take place in the first year of this project.

Project #3

As with the previous project, this one offered little opportunity for the youth to participate in the planning and management of the project. Contrary to the previous example, though, this program did not experience the negative reactions of the youth or delayed implementation that affected the earlier project. The workings of this project will be described with an emphasis on the roles youth did play.

Failure to Involve Youth in Responsible Action

Early observations were conducted at this project in November 1978. The project had just recently begun admitting children. The observations discuss the nature of the project and the way the community has responded to the project. For example, a typical day at the center might see the teacher-student interaction in this manner.

> ...The principal and his secretary went to the cafeteria where a group of pre-school children were lined up along the wall by the teacher and her student aides. The children seemed happy. The teacher was giving instructions to the aides on how to bring the pre-schoolers back to the day care center. The aides then guided the children out of the lunchroom and then back to the child care center. (November, 1978)

The aides are students who have been hired with Youthwork funds to work in the child care center. The normal teacher-student relationship has not been altered by the new project. The teacher teaches and the student listens and follows instruction.

In an effort to give some responsibility to the youth, one teacher tried not to stand over the youth to make them do the work. He explained the task to be done and left the youth to accomplish it. An example of this was recorded by the on-site observer:

> ...Roger*told a couple of his students to get the string and measure "The way I showed you"--two students held the string while other students dug a ditch parallel to the string. Roger left his students who were digging the ditch and came over to speak to the observers. Roger did not stand over the boys and make them do the work. He would tell the students how to do something and then let them do it themselves. (December, 1978)

While this observation seems to show some independent initiative on the part of the youth, the following incident (also recorded by the observer) suggests that things were not quite what they appeared.

> ...While Roger was standing with the observer, a few of the students called to him, "The string broke." Roger went back over to the group and helped them set up a new string. (December, 1978)

Planning and Decision Making

The teacher for the business component of the project claimed not to know what the goals of the project were. This was in January 1979 in an interview with the observer. She was quoted as saying:

> ...Concerning the grant, Colleen said that she is not familiar with the overall goals and that she has never received a written set of goals. (January, 1979)

This unfamiliarity with the goals of the project was reflected in the way the business component was operated. There was little participation by the youth in planning and decision making.

*The names used are pseudonyms.

The business teacher was not the only instructor who did not seem to be aware of the goal of including the youth in management of the project. Bradshaw, who teaches the carpentry course, was asked if he was aware of the project's goals. His response left little doubt as to his lack of understanding about the nature of a youth-operated project.

> ...Bradshaw responded that the goal he has continually stressed to his students is making the students aware of the advantages they have through this program. Bradshaw reiterated that the only thing which would be a problem in the future had to do with getting students placed in the right (jobs) based on their abilities. (January, 1979)

The task of assignment of youth to different jobs was taken a step further. Project staff had determined that it was important for the youth to be motivated if they were going to remain in the program. In January 1979, Bradshaw described the work of the teachers.

> ...At the moment, Bradshaw indicated that the teachers were trying to pinpoint those students truly interested in the program and willing to stick with it. Also, Bradshaw noted that now the teachers were trying to weed out those students who were not serious about it. (January, 1979)

This effort seems contrary to another project mandate: that of providing training to the most disadvantaged youth. This is consistent with what seems to be a major function of schools: tracking students according to ability. While this may be appropriate under normal school circumstances, it defeats the purpose of employment and training programs which are designed to serve the most severely disadvantaged youth.

Meeting Genuine Needs

The project has managed to meet some needs of both the individual and society. The skill training provided new opportunities for the youth to acquire jobs and be self-supporting and thereby, possibly, reducing the need for society to support them through social welfare programs. This

represents the basic aim of the project, which was to provide skill training to otherwise unemployable youth.

In the broader definition of need encompassed in the word "development", the project was less successful. There is no evidence that the developmental needs, as illustrated in the guidelines for youth-operated projects, have been met. The abilities of youth to manage, decide, and operate this project were neglected. The need to develop more competent youth through these experiences was thwarted by the inability of project staff to implement a youth participation strategy.

Critical Reflection

There were no opportunities for critical reflection by the youth at this project. Given that the project did not encourage youth participation, the issue of critical reflection on that experience is devoid of meaning.

Brief Summary

There was little attention paid to what should have been the major function of the project: the encouragement of youth participation in all phases of management of the project. It was evident from the data that many instructors either did not view youth participation as a high priority or were just unaware of that aspect of the project proposal.

This failure to implement the youth participation strategy, in terms of this analysis, means that the project itself failed to achieve one of its primary goals. On the other hand, it is clear that the youth involved in this project have learned some valuable skills.

The traditional school setting for the project was a major inhibiting factor. The project hired teachers to run courses and supervise the youth in each of the service efforts. There was no effort at changing the traditional teacher-student relationship. This led to many students playing passive roles in the project and thus failing to garner the experiences and talents that active participation in the project would have engendered.

Project #4

The fourth project represents one that achieved a high degree of youth participation. Very early in the evolution of the project, the staff were complaining about their inability to involve the youth in certain key decisions. This led to a redoubling of their efforts to get youth participation. One instructor described the problem this way:

> ...He described a Catch-22 in that they would like to have the kids involved as much as possible in the different service projects, but that they had deadlines to meet. They had to get the brochure out, so they did it without the student's help. They also had to develop some policies without the students. Eventually, the instructor expects that the students will become actively involved in the interviewing and hiring of other students through the personnel office, explain all of the different programs, and maybe give tours of the different job sites. He describes it as perhaps a bit ambitious but as what he is shooting for. (October, 1978)

The observations at this site have focused on the touring theatre group. This group is made up of adult instructors and students who come together to develop their acting skills. The goal of the program is to put on several benefit productions with the students being in charge of the effort. Several examples from the data on the touring group are presented to illustrate how this project has met the criteria used to determine youth participation.

Responsible Challenging Action

The theatre group included approximately 60 students and a sizeable staff. The emphasis in the group was to be on cooperation and collaboration. It would take many people and their various skills to make the theatre production a reality.

In early December 1978 the group held its first organizational meeting. The first order of business was a clarification of the rules (no smoking, etc.). The observer describes what followed:

> ...The threatre group went through a number of exercises. On one, there was a contest. Five kids would have to get up and improvise a scene. The idea would be to see who laughs last. The students became enthralled with the contest and forgot that they were working on an acting exercise. It was very encouraging and had everyone's full attention for an hour and a half. (December, 1978)

After the exercises, there were meetings to decide what plays the group was going to perform. This was designed to give the youth responsibility for the work to be done.

After watching the exercises on a couple of occasions, the on-site observer felt moved to make a personal comment on what he saw as the strong point of the interactions at the touring theatre group. He commented:

> ...I would like to add a personal note here. As an educator, I am highly impressed with the method of teaching which has kids act out certain situations that have political and social ramifications (for example, racial tensions). It seems, perhaps, the best way to teach anything, because the kid has to put himself in the shoes of the other person and try to understand what that person is going through. (December, 1978)

Does the Project Meet Genuine Needs?

The project does seem to meet genuine needs both for the youth and the society though the evidence was slim for the needs of society. For

the youth, it gives them the opportunity to pursue an interest in acting. The project helped develop acting skills and provided a medium (the play) for the testing of those skills. It should be noted that other skills besides acting were also being taught. Those included set building, directing, and casting. The role of this project for the individual was to allow exposure to this occupation by disadvantaged youth. Evidence of the need for this exposure comes from a staff meeting where one of the theatre group staff began:

> ...Only 3 of the 20 students in the group have ever seen a play. Most have no idea what the Brannan Theatre is (it is the third largest repertory theatre in the country). Not many of the kids can afford the price of a ticket, though she would like to get them to see some theatre. (January, 1979)

The societal benefits can only be inferred. The benefit might come in the form of the development of a highly talented performer who might otherwise have not pursued a career in this direction, or something more mundane as exposing more individuals to the arts. Certainly, if this project has any positive affects on the youth, it will be reflected in positive outcomes for some portion of society.

Youth Involved in Planning and Decision Making

From the beginning, youth were to be highly involved in the decision making at this project. The early situation where youth met with staff to decide what plays would be performed was just one example of youth participation. About two weeks after the decision had been made on the script to be used, the following interaction, which illustrates the degree of input youth have had in this project, took place at the touring theatre group.

> ...Cranston had a headache and didn't say much today. Bird ran most of the class. She explained that the last three weeks has been kind of an introduction and now it was time to get to work. What will we do for the performance? She said that the play that a student had written that they had been using at that point was no longer acceptable. They would have to come up with something else. The student defended her script for some time. Then, she accepted the idea that her script was no longer being used. (December, 1978)

> ...They broke into a brainstorming session. First, the whole group and then in groups of four or smaller. They had a list of ideas. The list included the following: rowing up; making it; girls in relationships; what to do with their lives; cults; child abuse; hospitals; prisons; and a take-off on soap operas. (December, 1978)

Another example, somewhat less significant but still illustrative of the youths' ability to participate, occurred later in this same session. As the instructors began to break the group down into smaller groups,

> ...Bird then was going to number the kids and have them work in groups. One of the students who is doing very well in the class, a very talented young lady, said "we are not kids anymore. We can mix our own groups. You do not need to number us." So they let them find their own groups. (December, 1978)

The youth were highly motivated and participated often in the planning and decision making at this project. Several items that seemed to encourage this participation were: (1) the high ratio of youth to adult staff in the interaction setting; (2) the necessity of having the cooperation of the youth if the play was to be successfully completed; and (3) the youth having a feeling of ownership of the activity (It's my play!).

Critical Reflection

The criteria of youth participation was not overtly present at this site. There were no structured opportunities for discussion among the youth

about their experiences in the youth-operated project. While it may have existed, examples were not available in the data. This is a serious shortcoming in that it suggests that there was not a major emphasis placed on the role of youth participation and the possible beneficial outcomes for the youth.

Brief Summary

This project was successful in achieving three of the four criteria of youth participation. There was evidence that youth were involved in responsible challenging action which met genuine needs. Youth were also intimately involved in the planning and decision making of the project. The last component, critical reflection about the experience, was not evident from the data.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper has examined four youth employment projects designated by Youthwork, Inc., as youth-operated to ascertain what facilitates/inhibits the implementation of a youth participation strategy. The four criteria used to determine effective implementation of the youth participation strategy were the following:

*Does the project involve the youth in responsible challenging action?

*Does the project meet genuine needs?

*Are youth involved in planning or decision making that affects others?

*Is there a chance for critical reflection about the experience?

Using these criteria, two case studies were presented that showed positive results in implementing the youth participation strategy. Two others were not successful in instituting the concept of youth participation.

Inhibitors of Youth Participation

There is a need to understand the forces at work when a relatively new concept such as youth participation is being introduced. The employment/training bureaucracy, for one, is seriously threatened by the idea tha youth are capable of making decisions and managing their affairs alone. Many adult jobs are dependent upon the notion that youth are basically incapable of rational decision-making and planning. So, when a program suggests that youth should be allowed to manage their own affairs to some degree, the adult bureaucracy reacts defensively. A good example of this comes from case 2 where the adult staff were determined that they, not the youth, should control the project. This problem stemmed from both a lack of understanding about the concept of a youth-operated project itself and from the views of the staff that the program (and their jobs) was designed to help rehabilitate the youth. The assumption was that youth were incapable of managing their own affairs. This leads to the first two recommendations.

1) Youth-operated projects as a form of youth participation need to be more fully conceptualized and publicized. This is so that staff members of agencies that help disadvantaged youth will understand what the concept means and how to implement it effectively.

2) As one criteria, staff members should be hired for youth projects on the basis of their commitment to the idea that youth can and should manage their own affairs.

Understanding a concept is not in and of itself enough. As Pressman and Wildavsky (1973) have suggested, comprehension is not the same as implementation. By the same token, there is little evidence to support the idea that one can implement effectively without understanding the basic concept. Therefore, understanding should be seen as the first step towards effective implementation.

Other factors that operated to stifle the implementation of the youth participation strategy were (1) location of the project in a traditional school setting and (2) the failure to encourage the youth to take an active role in the management of the project. These two are, in some regards, part and parcel of the same problem. Locating the project in a traditional school meant that school teachers were to run the project. This inhibited the implementation by failing to change the traditional teacher-student relationship. Students, as a rule, sat passively awaiting instructions from the teachers on how project business should be handled. Teachers also did not encourage youth participation at this project. The following recommendations are offered to help correct these two problems.

3) Since relations between students and teachers in traditional school settings are relatively set and intractable, it is recommended that youth-operated projects not be funded in traditional school settings. Alternative programs such as experientially based career education might prove to be more appropriate vehicles for projects of this type.

4) Each youth-operated project should be required to offer motivational seminars on a periodic basis which would encourage youth participation and illustrate the roles to be played and the potential developmental gains to be had from active participation.

Facilitators of Youth Participation

Even more important than understanding what inhibits the implementation of a youth participation strategy is knowing what promotes and enhances that strategy. Two such events that seemed to facilitate youth participation were a high ratio of adults to youth (one adult overseeing the entire project) and the delegation of authority for the everyday functioning of the project to the youth. This must also be complemented by a feeling of ownership of the project by the youth and the knowledge that their (the youth) decisions would not be arbitrarily

overturned by the presiding adult(s). These two events represent the first two recommendations for facilitating a youth participation strategy.

5) The presence of adults in the day-to-day workings of youth-operated projects should be minimal. In other words, as few adults as possible should be used to oversee the project.

6) A companion recommendation is that all day-to-day operations of the project be delegated to the youth. The role of the adult in a youth-operated project is to advise and the role of youth is to manage. Too often, these roles are either confused or reversed.

These projects were high risk in nature in that CETA was under mandate to keep tight controls over them and one of the primary requirements for a youth-operated project was flexibility. The potential political liability of projects operated by youth was clearly evident, and the response of the CETA actors was to place adults in key positions and to refuse to give youth management authority.

Other factors that have encouraged youth participation were 1) relatively small numbers (10 or less) of youth working together and 2) having access within the community to persons who have expertise in the area of the youth enterprise. The latter was important in that many ventures failed because of a lack of knowledge of where to go to get information. This should not be construed as suggesting that adults should find these persons of expertise. To the contrary, youth should be encouraged to solicit help from those in the community with the skills to help them. The role of adults is to suggest potential starting or entry points for the youth. These are the final recommendations for facilitating youth participation:

7) The number of youth involved in a youth-operated project should be kept small so as to encourage participation from all members of the group. Also, see that every member has a sufficient role to play.

8) One of the key roles that adults can play at youth-operated projects is to facilitate contact with persons in the community who have expertise in the area of the youth project. Drawing on these community persons can encourage the success of the youth-operated project.

REFERENCES

Adams, A. and G.L. Mangum
1978 The Lingering Crisis of Youth Unemployment. Kalamazoo: W. E. Upjohn Institute.

Coleman, J.S., et al.
1974 Youth: Transition to Adulthood. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

Conrad, D.
1977 "Youth Participation: Volunteer Service:, Center for Youth Development, University of Minnesota, Unpublished Manuscript.

Dowell, C.
1977 "Youth Participation and the Needs of Youth and Society", National Commission on Resources for Youth, New York City, Unpublished Manuscript.

Dror, Y.
1968 Public Policymaking Reexamined. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Greer, C.
1977 "Rationale for Youth Participation Programs", National Commission on Resources for Youth, New York City, Unpublished Manuscript.

Hamilton, S. and A. Crouter
1980 "Work and Growth: A Review of Research Regarding the Impact of Work Experience on Adolescent Development", Human Development and Family Studies, Cornell University, Unpublished Manuscript.

Jones, C.O.
1975 Clean Air: The Policies and Politics of Pollution Control. Pittsburgh: University Pittsburgh Press.

Konopka, G.
1973 "Requirements for Healthy Development of Adolescent Youth", Adolescence, Vol. VIII, No. 31, Fall, pp. 1-26.

National Commission on Resources for Youth
1974 New Roles for Youth in the School and the Community. New York: Citation Press.

1975 "Youth Participation". A report prepared for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Human Development--Office of Youth Development.

Pressman, J.L. and A. Wildavsky
1973 Implementation. (Second Edition). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ripley, R.
1976 "The Evaluation of Program Implementation", Mershon Center Quarterly Report, Ohio State University, Vol. 1, No. 2.

Rivlin, A.
1974 "Social Policy: Alternate Strategies for the Federal Government", General Series Reprint 288. The Brookings Institution.

Van Meter, D.S. and C.E. Van Horn
1975 "The policy implementation process: a conceptual framework", Administration and Society, Vol. 6, February, 445-448.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Wilfred B. Holloway is a research associate for the Youthwork National Policy Study. In the past two years, he has served as liaison to the youth-operated programs sponsored through the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects funds while pursuing his Ph.D. at Cornell University. Current research interests lie in the areas of (1) school to work transition and its effects on adolescent development, (2) the use of qualitative research in program evaluation, and (3) the effectiveness of human service delivery. He has authored or co-authored several monographs and articles on youth employment programs. The most recent of these is entitled "Federal Intervention and Youth Programs: An Essay on the Viability of the Work Experience/Education Model". It has been published in the summer 1980 issue of CHILDREN AND YOUTH SERVICES REVIEW.